

Remarks

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 10, 12 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are pending.

I. Amendments

Claim 10 has been amended to recite an identity document comprising at least one communication marking provided on at least a portion of the perimeter edge surface, the communication marking being formed from a non-visible ink. This amendment is supported by the original disclosure, for example, page 6, lines 29-30 to page 7, lines 1-12, and Figures 1-2.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite a communication marking on a portion of the first major surface. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least at page 8, lines 16-20.

Claim 28 has been amended to recite a light source positioned to provide light to the reading area and a light receiver positioned to sense light reflected from the perimeter edge surface. This amendment is supported by the original disclosure, for example, page 9, lines 27-30 to page 10, lines 1-12, and Figures 5-7.

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

II. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-24 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,913 to Cyr et al. (Cyr).

Claims 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,444,230 to Baldwin et al. (Baldwin).

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cyr in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,491,216 to May.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and reconsideration is requested in view of the following.

A. Claims 1, 10 and 18

Cyr does not disclose the card of claim 1, comprising first and second opposite major surfaces and a perimeter edge surface, and at least one communication marking provided on at

least a portion of the perimeter edge surface. The claimed perimeter edge surface does not constitute a portion of the first or second major surface (Applicant's specification, page 6, lines 22-30 and shown in Figures 1-2). The information 16 in Cyr is not provided on at least a portion of the perimeter edge surface. Rather, the two planar surfaces of Cyr are utilized for imprint or have the information 16 placed upon them (column 4, lines 55-58).

As noted by the Examiner in the Office Action, the markings in Cyr are located on the lower right hand corner of the envelope and not on a portion of the perimeter edge surface. Cyr discloses that the communication marking 16 can be printed on the inside 14 of envelope 10 as shown in Figure 1 of Cyr, on a portion of the contents of the envelope (column 5, lines 5-8), in the signature area 32 of a credit card 30 (column 6, lines 65-67), or the substrate 42 of card 40 (column 7, lines 6-9 and cross-sectional view of Figure 4). Cyr does not disclose providing a communication marking on a portion of the perimeter edge surface. Therefore, Cyr does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 10, as amended, recites an identity document, comprising first and second opposite major surfaces and a perimeter edge surface, and at least one communication marking provided on at least a portion of the perimeter edge surface, and the communication marking being formed from a non-visible ink. At the very least and as discussed above, Cyr does not disclose a communication marking provided on at least a portion of the perimeter edge surface. Therefore, Cyr does not anticipate claim 10.

Claim 18 recites a method of creating a verifiable identity document comprising providing an identity document having first and second opposite major surfaces and a perimeter edge surface, and forming at least one communication marking on at least a portion of the perimeter edge surface. At the very least and as discussed above, Cyr does not disclose a method that includes forming at least one communication marking provided on at least a portion of the perimeter edge surface. Therefore, Cyr does not anticipate claim 18.

B. Claims 2-9, 11-17, and 19-23

Claims 2-9, 11-17 and 19-23 depend from either claims 1, 10, and 18 and are patentable along with claims 1, 10, and 18 for at least the reasons given with respect to the independent claims. By not separately addressing these claims, Applicant does not concede the propriety of the rejections thereto and reserves the right to specifically address these claims at a later date.

C. Claim 24

Cyr does not teach a method of verifying an identity document, comprising forming at least one communication marking on at least a portion of a perimeter edge surface of the identity document, reading the communication marking and based on the reading, determining whether the identity document is the proper document. As noted by the Examiner in the Office Action the markings in Cyr are located on the lower right hand corner of the card and not on a portion of a perimeter edge. As discussed above, the markings in Cyr are located on planar surfaces and not on a portion of a perimeter edge. Therefore, claim 24 is not anticipated by Cyr.

D. Claims 25-27

Claims 25-27 depend from claim 24 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 24. By not separately addressing these claims, Applicant does not concede the propriety of the rejections thereto and reserves the right to specifically address these claims at a later date.

F. Claim 28

Claim 28 is patentable over Baldwin. The reader 10 disclosed by Baldwin comprises light sources 22 which strike a transparent window 34 in a card 16 and cast shadows of marks 36 located on the window 34 on a sensor 24 (column 4, lines 15-23). The sensor 24 senses light transmitted through the transparent window 34 in the card 16 (column 3, lines 40-42, column 4, lines 27-29). It is apparent from Figures 2, 3, and 9 that the reader disclosed in Baldwin does not comprise a light receiver positioned to sense light that has been reflected from the perimeter edge surface of a card.

Therefore, claim 28 is not anticipated by Baldwin.

G. Claims 29-30

Claims 29-30 depend from claim 28 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons give with respect to claim 28. Claims 29-30 need not be separately distinguished at this time. By not separately addressing claims 29-30, Applicant does not concede the propriety of the rejections thereto and reserves the right to specifically address these claims at a later date.


III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all claims should be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: July 6, 2004


James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE